

great principle is to betray our own practices and mores. For America to fail to do her part in an international situation where all look to her for leadership in accordance with her own blueprint is to make Independence Day itself a hollow and meaningless gesture.

For a century, as certainly this audience knows, the Greeks on Cyprus have fought for organic union with the mother country. Yet if the vote of the people, under the plebiscite, should favor some solution other than organic union with Greece, the best and most reliable information is that this would be acceptable to the Greek Government. It is impossible for me as an American, looking impartially at all angles of this situation, to find any of the disruptive and explosive and adamant elements of fanaticism in this proposition of the Greek Government. They ask first for a determination of the Cyprus peoples' destiny by the people themselves. They ask second that the plebiscite be supervised or managed by the United Nations. They declare then that whatever solution is arrived at in this plebiscite will be the governing judgment for Greece.

All Americans should know, since our whole world is now so integrated, that an episode anywhere affects us all, that the Cypriots' cry for amalgamation with Greece has echoed down through the centuries. It goes back to the moment in 1489 when Turkey fastened itself upon this exposed and vulnerable Mediterranean island. It cannot be said, and certainly the enlightened Turks of our time would not expect historians to report, that the government of Cyprus by the Turks was in any sense benevolent—and even hundreds of years of control is hardly

calculated to make their claims against the Greeks of Cyprus even slightly valid.

I cannot and would not before an informed audience like this attempt to pose as an expert on this very complex problem. But a study of the total facts makes it entirely plausible, it seems to me, to so rearrange gently and considerably the populations of the Greek and the Turkish islands in the general theater, as to soften, perhaps even heal, the rupture between Greece and Turkey. All of you, I'm sure would, in justice, want to assure the Turkish minority on Cyprus that their rights will be protected just as you want the Greek minority rights in Turkey to be protected.

It may be that in putting views like this before you there is more enthusiasm and wishfulness than realism—the hard and tough kind. And yet on consultations with some experts in the field I find that there is solid ground for my optimism. We live in an age released for the most part, from the bitter and enduring feuds of old. And—given self-determination—it is, as I see it, not beyond the realms of the possible and not altogether improbable but that Greece, Cyprus, Britain, and Turkey can emerge from this dilemma with a solution, while not absolutely satisfactory to all in every particular, can serve as the groundwork for lasting peace in the area.

This we know: No government on Cyprus will endure without self-determination. But, given the right to say who shall govern them, then the Cypriots agree to make concessions to the Turks in matters of religious and cultural freedom. There would be the safeguards of the United Nations. And the Turks would be granted a customs union with Turkey. Even here we see, as through-

out the Greek position, attitudes of reasonableness and even the outstretched hand of cooperation and amity. No—given strong international leadership and the directing influence of the massed will of world opinion as represented, for instance, in the United Nations, and it seems altogether feasible that under self-determination the solution in Cyprus could be found.

There are 530,000 people on Cyprus and 400,000 of them are Greeks—A statistic that speaks sensationally for itself. We have to remember that the three nations—Britain, Greece and Turkey—all belong to the Western bloc and all are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The major elements for understanding exist. The right with compelling obviousness belongs to the Greek position. The issue at heart is one of justice and sovereignty in keeping with precisely those ideals upon which rest the very foundations of the United Nations.

The hour, ladies and gentlemen, is critical. I hope that under the influence of the ideals that have marked man's forward march to freedom for the last 2,000 years, Cyprus and its people will find their place in the sun. I hope even more that the thinking of the Declaration of Independence, to which today we are rededicating ourselves, will emphasize to the American people how profoundly their tradition is bound up with the aspirations of the people on Cyprus. Just so long as men everywhere can see their common goal to freedom, the hope for freedom everywhere will not dim. It is my expectation that Cyprus will witness self-determination and that this may bring about a new dawn of justice and liberty in the Mediterranean theater and—I trust—eventually among all peoples of this planet.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 3, 1958

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, resident bishop of the Methodist Church in the Syracuse area, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of us all and Father of each of us, we bless Thy name that Thou art near enough for us to turn to Thee for light upon our way, for strength equal to the tasks at hand. May our minds be open to Thy truth, our wills responsive to Thy leading, throughout all this day.

On this anniversary of our country's birth, we bow to acknowledge Thee as maker of heaven and earth, the power that hath made and preserved us a Nation. We remember that truly America did not rise without Thy assistance. Now we pray that we may continue to seek and to accept Thy light and Thy salvation.

As we give thanks to Thee that in Thy providence our many States have become one Nation, indivisible, we this day lift our prayer for the new State which is about to take its place among us. God bless Alaska. We thank Thee for Thy bountiful gifts to that great land, and we pray that all who dwell within its ample borders may have reason to be grateful for this new day and this new relationship. May every good thing in all that land be strengthened, and every evil thing enfeebled by the enlarging fellowship that is America.

So may all our States be bound together in the pursuit of the happiness which may be attained alone where there is liberty and justice for all.

In the name of Christ, our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 2, 1958, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 2, 1958, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1706. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944, as amended;

S. 2224. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding advertised and negotiated disposals of surplus property; and

S. 2533. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to lease space for Federal agencies for periods not exceeding 10 years, and for other purposes.

### AGREEMENT WITH UNITED KINGDOM RELATIVE TO COOPERATION ON USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY FOR MUTUAL DEFENSE PURPOSES— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from

the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

#### *To the Congress of the United States:*

It has become manifestly clear of late that the countries of the Free World must, for their collective defense and mutual help, endeavor to combine their resources and share the large tasks that confront us. This is particularly true in the field of scientific research and development in support of greater collective security, notably in the field of military applications of atomic energy. Close collaboration between scientists and engineers of the United States and the United Kingdom during World War II proved most fruitful.

The Free World again faces a similar challenge which the free nations can most effectively meet by cooperating with one another in genuine partnership. I pointed out to the Congress earlier this year that it was "wasteful in the extreme for friendly allies to consume talent and money in solving problems that their friends have already solved—all because of artificial barriers to sharing." Since then the Congress has responded with necessary changes in our legislation on the basis of which this Government has just concluded an agreement with the Government of the United Kingdom which provides the framework for closer cooperation on uses of atomic energy for mutual defense purposes.

Pursuant to that legislation I am submitting to each House of the Congress an authoritative copy of the agreement. I am also transmitting a copy of the

Secretary of State's letter accompanying authoritative copies of the signed agreement, a copy of a joint letter from the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Secretary of Defense recommending my approval of this agreement and a copy of my memorandum in reply thereto setting forth my approval.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 3, 1958.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 2964. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to a compact between the State of Connecticut and the State of Massachusetts relating to flood control; and S. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim July 4, 1958, a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the resolution (S. J. Res. 12) to provide for transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7963) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. RAINS, Mr. McDONOUGH, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. BETTS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11451), to authorize the construction and sale by the Federal Maritime Board of a superliner passenger vessel equivalent to the steamship *United States*, and a superliner passenger vessel for operation in the Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 11477. An act to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13130. An act to extend for 2 years the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury in respect of transfers of distilled spirits for purposes deemed necessary to meet the requirements of the national defense;

H. R. 13192. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purpose; and

H. J. Res. 633. Joint resolution to designate the lake formed by the Ferrells Bridge Dam across Cypress Creek in Texas as Lake O' the Pines.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 803. An act for the relief of Claudio Guillen;

S. 2168. An act for the relief of Armas Edwin Jansson-Viik;

S. 2251. An act for the relief of Manley Francis Burton;

S. 2493. An act for the relief of Maria G. Aslanis;

S. 2819. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hermine Melamed;

H. R. 11451. An act to authorize the construction and sale by the Federal Maritime Board of a superliner passenger vessel equivalent to the steamship *United States*, and a superliner passenger vessel for operation in the Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim July 4, 1958, a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship.

#### HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 11477. An act to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 13130. An act to extend for 2 years the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury in respect of transfers of distilled spirits for purposes deemed necessary to meet the requirements of the national defense; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 13192. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 633. Joint resolution to designate the lake formed by the Ferrells Bridge Dam across Cypress Creek in Texas as Lake O' the Pines; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination to be considered.

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur J. Stanley, Jr., of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the purpose of considering the nomination of Arthur J. Stanley, Jr., of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly on the confirmation of the nomination of Arthur J. Stanley, Jr., of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas.

I have known Mr. Stanley and his family for many, many years. He comes from a fine, great family of lawyers.

This appointment will meet with almost unanimous approval by men and women in all walks of life in my State.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Judiciary Subcommittee and the members of the full Committee on the Judiciary, and, in particular, its chairman, for expediting in the way they have the consideration of the nomination. I say that on behalf of both my colleague [Mr. CARLSON] and myself, because of the necessity for acting as quickly as possible to fill this vacancy, which has existed in Kansas for quite some time.

#### ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION— NOMINATION OF JOHN A. McCONE, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, the nomination of John A. McCone, of California, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission is on the executive calendar; but the nomination has not been brought up today, only because we have not received the report from the committee. I give this notice so the Senate may know why we are not at this time passing on this nomination for membership on the Atomic Energy Commission, which has been unanimously approved.



## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## REPORT OF CIVIL AIR PATROL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chief of Information Services, Civil Air Patrol, Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that patrol, for the year 1957, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H. J. Res. 633. Joint resolution to designate the lake formed by the Ferrells Bridge Dam across Cypress Creek in Texas as Lake O' the Pines (Rept. No. 1798).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

H. R. 11414. An act to amend section 314 (c) of the Public Health Service Act, so as to authorize the Surgeon General to make certain grants-in-aid for provision in public or nonprofit accredited schools of public health of training and services in the fields of public health and in the administration of State and local public-health programs (Rept. No. 1797).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 4036. A bill to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluor spar, and tungsten from domestic mines (Rept. No. 1799).

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THYE:

S. 4104. A bill for the relief of Collingwood Bruce Brown, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 4105. A bill to require the expenditure of 60 per centum of the funds expended for military aircraft and missile repair and overhaul with private industry and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1958—AMENDMENT

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 4071) to provide more effective price, production adjustment, and marketing programs for various agricultural commodities.

This amendment would add a new title to Senate bill 4071, to include the provisions of the bill (S. 3420) to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as it

passed the Senate. References to subsections of section 104 of Public Law 480 have been changed to take into account the amendment of that section by section 502 (1) of the Mutual Security Act of 1958.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

## EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THURMOND submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 12591) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

## IMPROVEMENT OF ALASKA HIGHWAY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced for myself and five other Senators, Senate bill 4097, which would authorize the paving of the Alaska Highway. The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has asked that I also add his name as a cosponsor of this proposed legislation. I am delighted to do so. Minneapolis and St. Paul, in the Senator's State, will undoubtedly be one of the gateways on the way to Edmonton, in Alberta, and to Dawson Creek, which is the southern and eastern terminus of the Alaska Highway. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] be added as a cosponsor of S. 4097.

In addition, Mr. President, on the Senate floor today I have been informed that the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] desires to have his name added as a cosponsor of the bill to provide for the paving of the Alaska Highway, through mutual financing and activities of the Governments of the United States and Canada. I am particularly pleased to have the senior Senator from Utah as a cosponsor of the bill, because the Senator was a tower of strength and eloquence in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when we brought before the Senate the bill to admit Alaska as the 49th State. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] be added as a cosponsor of S. 4097.

Mr. President, I have likewise been informed by my good personal friend and colleague, the able senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] that he desires to be a cosponsor of the bill to provide for paving the Alaska Highway. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] was another ardent advocate of statehood for Alaska and one of the most persuasive Members of the Senate in successfully bringing the statehood bill to passage. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr.

ALLOTT] be added as a cosponsor of S. 4097.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

Address on education legislation, delivered by Representative LEE METCALF, of Montana, before the National Education Association, in Cleveland, Ohio, on June 28, 1958.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

Address by Representative ROBERT W. KEAN before the Long Branch, N. J., Committee for the Celebration of the 10th Anniversary of the State of Israel, Long Branch, N. J., June 1, 1958.

By Mr. BEALL:

Statement prepared by him concerning the 11th annual Delmarva chicken festival.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Statement prepared by him on mineral exploration bill.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Interview conducted by him with the Secretary of Agriculture on the present status of American agriculture, on June 29, 1958.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by Hon. Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, at dedication of the Eisenhower lock on the St. Lawrence seaway, at Massena, N. Y., on July 2, 1958.

## INCREASED USE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS FOR INDUSTRIAL PURPOSES

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has now reported Senate bill 4100, which provides for a research program on the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes.

Senate bill 4100 is a committee bill which resulted from committee consideration of proposed legislation which had been introduced in both sessions of this Congress. I have constantly urged the enactment of such a measure, and have been a sponsor of bills of this nature in both sessions of this Congress, as well as in the 84th Congress.

I certainly hope that Senate bill 4100 will be called up for consideration by the Senate in the near future, so it may receive final Congressional action before the adjournment of this Congress.

On Monday of this week, there appeared in the St. Paul Dispatch an editorial commenting on the need for further research into the industrial use of agricultural products. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Paul Dispatch of June 30, 1958]  
FINDING NEW USES FOR SURPLUS FARM PRODUCTS

Senator THYE is enthusiastic over prospects for long-range expansion of industrial markets for farm products. The Senate

Agriculture Committee bill for research in new uses for crops holds hope, he believes, of eventually licking the farm surplus problem.

For many years there have been predictions of greatly increased use of cultivated crops as raw materials for manufacturing purposes. There has been some fulfillment of this hope. Soy beans, for example, have an important industrial market because of their usefulness in making paint, soap, linoleum, and other manufactured items.

Systematic, comprehensive research programs to discover the hidden potentialities of farm products are needed. The bill supported by Senator THYE would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a new agency to initiate and coordinate research projects. It is THYE's belief that such a program would eventually double the market for farm products.

Private industry daily proves the value of research investments. In a field somewhat comparable to agriculture, the timber industry is now making headway in the development of many new byproducts obtainable from wood. Clyde B. Morgan, president of the Rayonier corporation, predicts that "in the future, chemical products from wood waste probably will exceed in value the lumber and pulp we now extract from the forests." A large number of valuable silvicultural chemicals are now being produced from wood, just as petrochemicals are byproducts of petroleum.

While some important research has been carried on in the industrial possibilities of farm products, there has been no national, overall program with sufficient financing to permit a continuing and comprehensive attack on the manifold problems and opportunities. This would be provided under the Senate committee bill.

Considering the millions and millions of dollars which the Government takes from taxpayers to finance crop price supports, soil bank payments, loss sales abroad, and other artificial and seemingly endless methods of holding up farm income, a substantial investment in industrial use research is more than justified. Congress should give the scientists an opportunity to show what they can accomplish in development of new markets for the surplus crops which now bulge Government warehouses all over the country.

#### DESIGNATION OF LAKE O' THE PINES, TEX.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 633) to designate the lake formed by the Ferrells Bridge Dam across Cypress Creek in Texas as Lake O' the Pines. The joint resolution was received from the House of Representatives today, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and reported by that committee, without amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. House Joint Resolution 633 to designate the lake formed by the Ferrells Bridge Dam across Cypress Creek in Texas as Lake O' the Pines.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the ques-

tion is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 633) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### IT IS TO BE HOPED THAT ALASKA WILL NOT LEGALIZE GAMBLING

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in today's New York Times there appears an interesting article to the effect that Alaska may seek to legalize gambling, in order to help balance its budget. I earnestly hope this will not prove to be the case.

The Times article points out that there is a certain amount of gambling background in Alaska. A Territory which is so relatively close to its wide-open frontier days may tend to look more kindly on legalized gambling than might, let us say, a highly industrialized State.

In Alaska, a certain number of lotteries and the like are now held by church and veterans' groups on a local basis.

Under the act by which Alaska is governed as a Territory, lotteries and gambling devices, as such, however, are banned. I hope that they will remain banned.

In my judgment, the history of legalized gambling in this country generally constitutes a complete indictment of the whole approach.

Mr. Virgil Peterson, operating director of the Chicago Crime Commission, has on many occasions pointed out that virtually everywhere that legalized gambling has been tried, as a so-called revenue raiser, it has turned out to be a net loss to society, and invariably has been eliminated.

I am not criticizing our friends in the State of Nevada. Nevada has been a member of the Federal Union for quite a long time now, and is a sovereign State, and is represented in the Congress by able men. Nevada has a right to establish its own policies as it sees fit, regardless of whether I, or anyone else, outside the State disagrees with them.

But Alaska will soon start on its course as the 49th State. I hope that it will not start on the wrong foot. I hope it will not be misled and deceived by the mirage of so-called "fat revenues" from legalized gambling.

As anticrime researchers have pointed out, for every dollar a city, county, or State may take in by taxing slot machines, roulette wheels, dice games, and the like, it loses \$2, \$3, \$5, in higher police costs, higher costs in the courts, higher penitentiary costs; and there is no way to reckon the cost of broken homes, of husbands who squander away the family pay checks, of wives who spend time at slot machines, instead of in the family kitchen or in PTA, of children who become utterly demoralized.

Legalized gambling is not the answer to Alaska's problems.

Every once in a while, some person proposes that legalizing a sin is the way to eliminate sin.

So it is that through the years Commissioner Harry Anslinger, of the Narcotics Bureau, has had to fight the good fight against those who recklessly want

to legalize narcotics. Other law-enforcement officials have had to fight the good fight against those who want to legalize prostitution.

What kind of a sense of morality do the proponents of these foolish notions have? How can one establish greater morality by sanctioning immorality? How can we cut down on dope addiction by telling the dope addict, "There is nothing wrong with your having narcotics, use them as you please. Ruin your life and ruin as many lives as you possibly can infect and poison."

I repeat that my remarks are directed to our friends of the Alaskan Territory. They are not intended as a criticism of any particular person, State, city, or county. They are voiced as a matter of principle, based upon my findings as a former member of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee.

The forces of the underworld invariably move into so-called legalized gambling. We can see that in Cuba and elsewhere in the world. The McClellan Investigating Committee is proving, at this very hour, how racketeers and criminals have wormed their way into almost every aspect of American life. Let us not permit them to have the sanction of legal approval.

I send to the desk the New York Times article, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA PONDERS LEGAL GAMBLING—MANY IN TERRITORY REGARD IT AS BUDGET BALANCER—LIQUOR OPERATION EYED

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, July 2.—Under the aura of potential statehood, Alaska was being pictured in some quarters today as a modified future Nevada, with legalized gambling helping to balance the budget of the 49th State.

Influential residents of the Territory, while agreeing that Alaska would have to scurry around for operating revenues, doubted that a really wide-open State was in the making.

Nevertheless, assuming that Alaskan voters in their plebiscite this fall endorse the action of Congress in approving statehood, the first State legislature seems destined next January to grapple with the question of what to do about gambling and liquor.

It appears likely that the fall campaign for the legislature will develop the issue of liberalizing Alaska along the lines of England, with legalized lotteries among other attractions for the gambling minded.

#### GAMBLING HERITAGE LINGERS

This Territory is mindful of mining camps, with hard-living sourdoughs. Those days have left their imprint on present-day Alaska.

It has ice-break-up-guessing lotteries, raffles of automobiles, boats, and other articles by civic clubs and veterans' groups for charitable purposes and bingo games under the auspices of labor unions, churches, and other organizations.

However, none of these activities pay a cent into the Territorial treasury. Under the act by which Alaska is governed as a Territory, lotteries and gambling devices are banned. As a practical matter the Federal Government takes its tax cut on payments of prizes on guessing lotteries such as the Nenana Ice Pool.

Tickets are \$1 each. Purchasers guess the day, hour, and minute at which the winter



ice pack breaks up at Nanana, on the Tanana River below Fairbanks.

#### GUESSERS MORE ACCURATE

In the earlier days of the pool the first-prize winner sometimes collected as much as \$80,000 or \$100,000. The pool has become so popular and the guessing so accurate nowadays there are times 10 or a dozen persons divide the top award.

A similar, new guessing lottery is operated by a junior chamber of commerce. This is based on the break-up of glacial ice at Lake George in the Matanuska Valley.

It is the thinking among some legislative leaders that gambling should be legalized, with good law enforcement, the lifting of no lids, and its handling as legitimate business to provide good revenues for the State.

It would include pari-mutuel betting, either paving the way for dog-racing tracks in Alaska or further popularizing dog-sled team racing.

The dog team contests over 25-mile snow-covered courses now are leading attractions in spring programs at both Anchorage and Fairbanks. Backers of regulated gambling envision a pari-mutuel operation with big prizes for events of this type.

#### LIQUOR SETUP WEIGHED

There were forecasts of an effort to put the new State into the liquor business as a wholesaler.

Actually, a bill to that end for the Territory was introduced at the 1957 session of the legislature. Victor Rivers, president of the Territorial senate, who is weighing an inclination to run this fall for either Governor or the Senate, was the co-author of a measure that he estimated would provide the Territorial treasury with \$2½ million a year.

Should a similar measure be passed by the State legislature Alaska would take over liquor wholesaling from a group of distributors. The State would then sell to retail outlets, collecting its profit. The 1957 bill did not come to a vote on the floor.

#### WIDE-OPEN STATUS DOUBTED

According to some legislative sources it would be unrealistic to attempt to make Alaska a wide-open State.

"The churches are too strong up here for that," a legislator remarked.

As the matter of State revenues was receiving attention on several sides, it was still uncertain whether the Territorial Legislature would be called into session to provide funds for the primary and general elections that must take place by December 1 under the terms of the statehood bill.

Waino Hendrickson, Secretary of Alaska and Acting Governor in the absence of Gov. Michael A. Stepovich, was conferring with other Territorial officials in Juneau, the capital, to try to find ways of speeding up the actions necessary to pave the way to statehood.

There was still a hope that money for the elections might be found without the need to call a special legislative session.

#### NONINTERFERENCE IN LATIN AMERICAN AFFAIRS; THE PRESIDENT'S WISE DECISION AGAINST USE OF FORCE IN CUBA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to point out the wisdom of the President of the United States in spurning the advice of some people to use force in order to secure the release of Americans imprisoned by the Cuban rebels or, for that matter, held captive by anyone else.

The welcome fact that the first captive Americans have begun to be released from the Oriente Mountains and the fact that the Cuban rebel leader has ordered

the others released—if radio reports are to be believed—indicates the soundness of President Eisenhower's position.

#### INDIGNATION AT MISTREATMENT OF AMERICANS

Let me say that I share with those of my colleagues who have commented on this subject their deep feeling of protest and outrage at the manhandling of any American national.

The fact that any United States civilian or serviceman is kidnapped by any group, anywhere, might be construed as an insult to the American flag.

Under these circumstances, it is essential, as the State Department well realizes, that the most vigorous diplomatic representations be made, through the appropriate channels, to secure immediate release of our nationals.

Down through the years, time and time again, we have been shocked at the vicious attitude of Soviet Russia, of the Peking regime in Red China, and of other satellite countries, in internment—yes, even imprisoning for life—American citizens.

If we are to respect ourselves, and if the world is to respect us, we can hardly look, with idle apathy, on such irresponsible behavior on the part of other nations or regimes or forces.

#### GET CAPTIVE AMERICANS BACK ALIVE

But President Dwight D. Eisenhower is correct. When an American is wrongly imprisoned, our desire is to get him back, and to get him back alive.

Moreover, our desire is not to complicate our diplomatic situation still further, and get our country into even deeper and hotter water than it might already be in.

In other words, the questions which statesmen must always ask are: Are we creating a mountain out of a molehill? Are we causing more trouble than we are actually solving? If we foolishly hurl an ultimatum, what will happen if the ultimatum expires? What will be the immediate and the long-range consequences?

Too often, some Americans react, off the cuff, to a situation such as those we have recently encountered by saying, "Let's send in the marines," or some other armed force.

In my judgment, any such off-the-cuff, hasty, ill-considered policy is not only self-defeating, but reckless and harmful.

#### WHY GIVE FUEL TO RED PROPAGANDA?

Why should we play into the hands of Communist propagandists?

For years, they have been trying to paint us throughout the world as "warmongers," brandishing atomic bombs and "eager to spill innocent blood."

For years, they have tried to smear us in Latin America as "Yankee imperialists," as the "colossus of the north," and they would like us to revert back to former times when the United States Marines and troops were dispatched on occasion in the Central American and Caribbean area.

Mr. President, we Americans are not imperialists; we do not believe in the use of force; we do not believe in armed intervention.

We do not want to interfere, or meddle, in any internal affair in Latin America,

either for or against an existing government, whether it be a democratic or a dictatorial regime.

Our sentiments about freedom itself are well known. We believe in freedom. We deplore dictatorship in any manner, shape, or form. We long and hope for the day when all the peoples of the earth will enjoy the standards—political, economic, moral, and spiritual—which we enjoy. We condone no slavery anywhere. We condone brute force nowhere.

But we do not propose to impose our own free way by bayonet.

We do not propose to allow Communist propaganda to seize upon any misguided United States action, however idealistically it might be motivated, as alleged proof that we are meddlers in Latin America's internal affairs.

We propose to be correct in our diplomatic relations with all governments—especially with those with whom we are allied in the struggle against communism.

#### LET US ACT UNDER WORLD LAW

President Eisenhower is right. Let us continue to observe the law of nations. Let us act for law, and within law, and under law.

Let us not "shoot from the hip."

Let us think twice before we take any action which we may regret. Let us have no ultimatums at Moscow, or Peking, or anywhere else, without thinking it over and over and over again.

Let us protect the good name of the American flag and the honor of this Republic. Let us extend every responsible protection which we can to American citizens, but let us not act in a hasty, ill-considered manner.

Too much is at stake.

We are leaders, and a leader must be deliberate and mature and reasonable in his actions.

We are the most powerful nation on earth, but we must use our power with discretion.

For greater than the power of United States bayonets is the power of United States right ideas. And the idea of self-determination of all peoples—freedom from foreign control or domination—is one such idea.

#### ERNEST GRUENING AND E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the United States Senate took a momentous and long-awaited step on June 30 in voting to admit the Territory of Alaska as the 49th State of the Union. I am proud to have been one of those who voted to provide Alaska its full measure of justice by putting it on equal footing with the other States that have contributed so much to our society.

As we all know, such actions as this do not occur without urging and support. There must be those who are willing to dedicate themselves to the task of bringing to the attention of responsible public officials the justification of their cause. This has certainly been true in the case of admitting Alaska as a State. Seldom in my experience have I known more dedicated and able men than those who

provided the leadership in the fight for Alaskan statehood. In particular, I should like to pay tribute to Ernest Gruening and E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, whom I have known personally for years, and for whom I have the highest regard. They were truly inspired by a zeal for statehood, and I think the realization of their dream can largely be attributed to their efforts.

Dr. Gruening is perhaps more familiar with Alaskan public affairs than any person alive today. After a distinguished career as a reporter and editor, and later as administrator under Franklin Roosevelt, he became the Governor of Alaska in 1939, a post he retained until 1953. During those years he guided and directed the efforts of that Territory in developing and maturing politically and economically. He was always associated with liberal causes, and he made the people of Alaska conscious of their political rights and also of their political responsibilities.

While Ernest Gruening was at home helping to prepare the people of Alaska for statehood, BOB BARTLETT was serving as Delegate from the Territory of Alaska in the House of Representatives here in Washington. I met BOB BARTLETT when he came to Washington in 1945, and have always cherished his friendship. Although he lacked a vote in the House, he was highly regarded in that Chamber, and his voice was always heard and listened to on important matters facing the House. Of course, his primary concern was with statehood for the Territory of Alaska. He introduced a bill for Alaskan statehood in 1947, and similar bills in every session of the Congress thereafter.

In 1956 Ernest Gruening was elected "Senator" from Alaska under the "Tennessee plan." Like the Senators from Tennessee who were elected prior to the time Tennessee was admitted to the Union, he and his associates were sent to present their credentials and argue the merits of the case for Alaskan statehood. The combined efforts of Dr. Gruening, BOB BARTLETT, and the others who worked with them provided the momentum which culminated in passage of the statehood bill at this session.

I sincerely hope that the Nation will continue to have the services of such able and dedicated men as Ernest Gruening and BOB BARTLETT. I am convinced that one of the best arguments for statehood was the presence of these two men here as representatives of Alaska. Any Territory that can send men of such high caliber as these two must certainly be ready for statehood.

#### TRANSFER OF RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR YELLOWTAIL DAM AND RESERVOIR—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) to provide for transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, and payment to Crow Indian Tribe

in connection therewith, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of July 2, 1958, pp. 12975-12976, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on the conference report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

The Senate today is being asked to approve a compromise proposal for the purchase of some 7,000 acres of Crow Indian tribal lands that are necessary to the construction of Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir in southeastern Montana on the Big Horn River.

The provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 12 as reported from the conference appear to be the most reasonable solution possible to the difficulties surrounding the transfer of the title of these Indian lands. I have always felt and continue to feel that the Crow Indians deserve a settlement of at least \$5 million. This was the figure agreed to by the tribal council, approved by the Senate last year and endorsed by the Congress in the 84th Congress. In addition there is ample support for such a payment based on engineering and legal data.

My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana, Mr. MURRAY, worked hard for the \$5 million in committee and I know that our colleagues in the House, Representatives LEE METCALF and LEROY ANDERSON, would prefer the acceptance of the \$5 million price tag.

However, to insure that the settlement can be made expeditiously, a compromise payment of \$2,500,000 to the Crow Indian Tribe has been agreed to by the conferees. The provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 12 set this payment as the floor and the Crow Tribe may appeal to the court of claims or the district court in Montana for additional compensation based on power site values, not now considered in the payment. I feel that the courts will have an obligation to award the tribe additional compensation based on the recent court decision handed down by Judge William Jameson in the Montana District Court.

Yellowtail Dam needs to be constructed and will be built. It would indeed be unfortunate if the Congress were to allow this land to be taken by condemnation for an infinitesimal fee.

Yellowtail Dam is a multipurpose project with numerous benefits—power, irrigation, flood control, recreation, and conservation. It is a good project. It is fully repayable with interest to the Federal Government and will be of great benefit to the Billings-Hardin area in Montana. This project is ready to go, it is a perfect antirecession measure in an area where new sources of employment and income are sorely needed.

The Crow Indians, as do all Indians, constitute a special case, well established in our laws. The provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 12 give the Crow Tribe a sound base for settlement and allows them to appeal to the courts for additional compensation. The passage of this joint resolution will assure

the Indians that they have this additional course of action.

The Crow Indians have been most cooperative in advancing the development of this vital multipurpose project in southeastern Montana and neighboring Wyoming. Many of them have recognized the difficulties encountered and the majority, according to information at my disposal, have endorsed the \$2,500,000 payment based on the proviso that they may appeal for additional compensation in the appropriate courts of the Nation. Although I am still in favor of a \$5 million payment I bow to the will of the majority and recognize that expeditious approval of this legislation is important so that Congress can appropriate funds this session to begin construction of Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir in fiscal year 1959. To do otherwise would be a dereliction on the part of the Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I may say I am disappointed—and I know I speak for my senior colleague from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]—that we were not able to get for the Crow Nation the \$5 million, which is a fair price, and which is something to which they are entitled. However, with the House refusing to yield, there was nothing else for the conferees to do but agree to the report which is now before the Senate.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am in accord with the remarks of my distinguished colleague.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The report was agreed to.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to announce for the information of the Senate that several very important bills have been reported to the Senate and are now on the calendar and may be cleared and scheduled for consideration at any time in the near future. Among the bills are:

Calendar No. 1766, S. 4035, the housing bill.

Calendar No. 1801, S. 4071, the farm bill.

Calendar No. 1829, S. 4051, the atomic energy authorization bill.

Calendar No. 1832, H. R. 12858, the public works appropriation bill.

This list of bills is, of course, not meant to be exclusive.

I announce also that it is the intention of the leadership to consider the unfinished business, Calendar No. 1717, S. 3817, the minerals exploration bill, on Monday.

Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana.

#### THE LEBANESE SITUATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the past 8 weeks there has been a good deal of discussion relative to the situation in Lebanon. I am fully aware of the difficulties confronting the President of the United States and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in trying to find a reasonable solution to what seems to be an impasse in our international relations.

I have been somewhat disturbed by reports carried in the press to the effect that a blank check has been offered to



President Camille Chamoun and that under certain circumstances, the United States was prepared to intervene in the area.

Mr. President, the answer to the Lebanese situation is not intervention by the United States and the United Kingdom, or by the United States alone. The answer is an extension of the present U. N. police force now patrolling the Gaza Strip and the Gulf of Aqaba area to the borders of Lebanon. In my opinion, an additional force of 1,500 men would be enough to take care of the situation and prevent the continued infiltration of Syrian personnel and arms, and bring about a degree of stability to this most important, to us, of the Arab countries of the Middle East.

The international character of the dispute can be regarded as established through the dispatch of a number of U. N. observers and also through the activities of United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld. Unilateral military measures in the Lebanon would create more problems than it would solve. It would also bring about the creation of a situation with which we found fault almost 2 years ago at the time of the Israeli-French-British invasion of the Suez. The only kind of intervention which should take place—if intervention is the only answer—is intervention authorized by the United Nations, and, if so authorized, it had better come through an extension of the present U. N. police force, and not from Britain and the United States, or the United States alone.

The task is now, and has been for the past 8 weeks, to bring this matter to the United Nations, and, through the United Nations, to expand and extend the police force so that it could patrol the borders of Lebanon. This would be far cheaper, more statesmanlike, and more conducive in the long run to bringing stability to Lebanon and a degree of peace to the Middle East. Any other kind of intervention would weaken the position of the roles of the rulers of Iraq and Jordan, and would pave the way, in my opinion, for their overthrow, through the dissemination of mass propaganda from Cairo. Allied or United States intervention could well be the stroke which would bring all the Middle East under the control of Nasser and create a situation which would be beneficial only to the Soviet Union, and extremely harmful to the best interests of the United States and the West.

Mr. President, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, I am aware of the difficulties and responsibilities confronting President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, who are charged with the conduct of our foreign policy. It is my opinion they are trying under extreme circumstances, to work out a solution through the United Nations. It would be my hope this could be done before it is too late, because I feel and they know that the stakes are high in the Middle East. If we make the wrong move through unilateral intervention on our part, or joint intervention with the United Kingdom, I am afraid the result

could be disastrous so far as we and our friends in the free world are concerned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD along with my remarks a number of newspaper articles on this subject.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of July 2, 1958]

**DULLES SEES UNITED STATES TROOPS IN LEBANON AS LAST RESORT—HE SEEKS TO ALLAY FEARS OF IMMINENT INTERVENTION, CITES U. N. ROLE IN CRISIS—FREER RED TRADE IS FORECAST**

WASHINGTON.—Secretary of State Dulles moved to ease fears that Uncle Sam might be on the verge of sending troops into embattled Lebanon.

He said United States military intervention would be "a sort of measure of last resort." And he made clear that the United States still expects the United Nations to cope with the troubles.

But Mr. Dulles also carefully noted that the United Nations charter sanctions non-U. N. action to defend a country against attack if the U. N. is stymied by a veto or other tangles.

#### BID TO CALM SPECULATION

The top United States diplomat thus attempted to calm speculation over possible United States moved in Lebanon while leaving himself room for maneuver in case that country's Western oriented government gets in even deeper danger than it is at present. In a sense, Mr. Dulles was trying to dampen down fires which he himself kindled at his press conference 2 weeks ago. At that time, Mr. Dulles declared that the United States would send troops into Lebanon under certain conditions. He failed to define these conditions but said they did not necessarily depend upon United Nations approval.

With that statement and in light of the presence of the strong United States Sixth Fleet in the eastern Mediterranean, uncertainty arose as to just what the United States intended to do.

That uncertainty still remains, of course. Mr. Dulles, however, appeared yesterday to be moving United States action back into the remote regions rather than talking it up as an immediate possibility. This move was clearly designed to calm some of the strong denunciations of the United States which have been coming from Lebanese opposition groups and certain other Mideast quarters. These groups contend Uncle Sam is making things worse in Lebanon by talking of direct interference in a national problem. The United States has, of course, already sent planes, guns, ammunition, and other equipment to Lebanese Government troops.

#### HOT FIGHT CONTINUES

As Mr. Dulles talked to his press conference, hot fighting continued to rage in the little Middle East country. Government troops and jet planes attacked rebel forces in the hills surrounding the capital city of Beirut. Government armor was reported making headway in dislodging well-armed rebel fighters.

Mr. Dulles and his aides make few bones about their desire to keep the prowestern government of President Camille Chamoun in power. If his Government topples, diplomats here fear Moslem forces friendly to Egypt's dictator, Gamal Abdel Nasser, President of the United Arab Republic, will take over. These Americans see such an event as a victory in Colonel Nasser's avowed campaign to dominate the entire Arab world from the Persian Gulf to the Atlantic coast of North Africa.

At the same time, United States influence would shrivel and Russian power in the

Middle East would expand, United States strategists worry. For this reason, the State Department has kept itself immersed deeply in the Lebanese trouble ever since they mushroomed into violence in early May.

At present, United Nations border observers are in Lebanon watching for smuggling of men and arms to the rebels from the neighboring Syrian portion of Colonel Nasser's U. A. R. This U. N. action is designed to let Lebanese fight their own battles without agitation from abroad. But considerable doubt exists about how successful the small U. N. group will be. As Mr. Dulles told reporters yesterday, the group is not a police force that could use arms to halt smuggling.

Mr. Dulles, however, said U. N. Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld believes the observers are slowing up or stopping the movement of material and personnel from Syria. On the other hand, the Secretary noted, the Lebanese rebels already may have built up stockpiles of arms which will fulfill their needs even if the movement from Syria halts.

"We do not think it is proper yet to conclude that those processes (the U. N. inspection measures) have failed or will fail," Mr. Dulles declared. "If and when we had to reach that conclusion, then there would be a new situation which we would have to deal with in the light of the new circumstances at the time." Mr. Dulles said that if the United States did intervene in Lebanon, it would not be analogous with the 1956 invasion of Egypt by Britain, France, and Israel. In the Suez war, the countries invaded against the will of the Egyptian Government. But in Lebanon, the United States would intervene only because the Lebanese Government was calling for assistance, he said.

#### MEASURE OF LAST RESORT

"Even though such United States action would be justifiable from a legal standpoint," the Secretary said, "it is not as good a solution as for the Lebanese to find a solution themselves . . . it would be a sort of measure of last resort."

During his press conference, the Secretary also forecast an easing soon in restrictions on exports to the Soviet bloc by the Western allies.

As has been reported earlier, the United States and 14 allies have been discussing this question in Paris for several months. Administration policymakers have disclosed they would go along sooner or later with this easing in controls. Britain, West Germany and other European trading nations have been particularly persuasive in favor of easing these restrictions. The United States, on the other hand, has tried to drag its feet where possible.

#### EASING ON BANS FORECAST

Mr. Dulles said, "It has been agreed, I think, that, given the industrial development within the Soviet bloc, some items which were on the (control) list originally do not properly have any place there any more. . . . I feel sure that the net result of this will be to reduce appreciably the prohibited list."

The trade controls currently ban sale to Russia and its satellites of goods considered strategic in that they would enable Russia to strengthen her war-making potential. Many machine tools, some copper goods, weapons and various industrial products are on the list. The debate comes over just what goods really would help Russia and which are those that Russia already has and which are not a hindrance to her by being blocked off.

The countries which control these shipments through so-called COCOM (standing for coordinating committee) agreements include the United States, Canada, Japan, Britain, France, West Germany, Italy, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, Portugal, Greece, and Turkey.

[From the New York Times of July 2, 1958]  
TRANSCRIPT OF SECRETARY DULLES' NEWS CONFERENCE, AS RELEASED BY THE STATE DEPARTMENT

#### LEBANON IS DISCUSSED

3. Question. Mr. Secretary, have Mr. Hammarhjold's reports indicated that there is less urgency about the crisis in Lebanon than seemed the case before he went there?

Answer. I think that the Secretary General feels that the action which has been taken and is being taken pursuant to the Security Council resolution is having the effect of slowing up at least, perhaps stopping, the movement of materiel and personnel across the border from the U. A. R.—Syrian part of it—and that may be the case.

He is in a better position to judge than we are. Of course it is pretty evident that a very large amount of support has already been acquired by the rebels within Lebanon, so that the situation is not corrected merely by stopping the current flow. It would help. It can be eased by that, but it isn't wholly corrected.

6. Question. Mr. Secretary, Mr. Chamoun of Lebanon is quoted this morning as saying that if the United Nations action fails, he would appeal to friends of Lebanon and the West for direct military assistance under article 51 of the United Nations Charter. Could you define for us under what circumstances the United States would be willing to render direct military assistance to Lebanon?

Answer. I will make a reply to your question, although I am not going to attempt to define in detail all the circumstances under which we might respond. I would say this: the normal way to deal with these problems is through the processes of the United Nations, and the Government of Lebanon initiated a process when it took its case to the Security Council and obtained the resolution for observation under which the Secretary General is now acting and under which I believe some results at least are being obtained.

#### OTHER WAYS TO AID CITED

Now we have never believed that you could only act under such processes; indeed, article 51 was put into the charter to meet the contingency that it might be impractical, because of the veto power or otherwise, to obtain appropriate action from the United Nations, article 51, as you will recall, talks about collective defense if an armed attack occurs.

Now, we do not think that the words "armed attack" precludes treating as such an armed revolution which is fomented from abroad, aided and assisted from abroad. Indeed, you will recall perhaps, in the report on the North Atlantic Treaty, that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee indicated that that kind of a civil disturbance could be treated as an armed attack.

In our Japanese Security Treaty that is expressly spelled out. However, we believe that the best way to deal with these things is through the processes of the United Nations. We do not think it is proper yet to conclude that those processes have failed or will fail. If and when we had to reach that conclusion then there would be a new situation which we would have to deal with in the light of the new circumstances at the time.

7. Question. Mr. Secretary, have the United Nations observers in Lebanon any authority or power to halt, to arrest, to seize, or to otherwise physically interfere with the infiltrations?

Answer. No. They are there to observe and to report. It is believed that the very fact that they are there in that capacity will have a practical effect in stopping movements across the border. Of course, that is somewhat diminished by the fact that the borders are not readily accessible

at the present time and it is hard to know just exactly what is going on.

But to answer your precise question. It is not my understanding that the present force there is in any sense a police force where they use armed force. That may be a second stage.

8. Question. Mr. Secretary, the Lebanese Government, through Mr. Chamoun and through its foreign minister, has in a variety of cases said it would be desirable for the United Nations to put enough people into Lebanon to seal off the border. What is our view toward such an operation?

Answer. I doubt whether it is practical to carry on an operation of that magnitude and I think that, perhaps, that is not required. But I would not want to pass any final judgment on that until I saw what kind of case the Government of Lebanon could make if they were to make such a request of the Security Council. So far they haven't made it and I would not want to prejudice our action before we know just what kind of case they could make out.

9. Question. Mr. Secretary, keeping in mind the role we played in discouraging at least the invasion of Suez, is it realistic to think that we would participate in any kind of military intervention in Lebanon except under the most extreme circumstances?

Answer. I don't think that there is any analogy whatsoever between the situation in Lebanon, where the lawful government is calling for assistance, and the Suez case, where the armed intervention was against the will of the government concerned. There is no parallel whatever between the two cases. We do believe that the presence in Lebanon of foreign troops, however justifiable—and it is thoroughly justifiable from a legal and international law standpoint—is not as good a solution as for the Lebanese to find a solution themselves. It would be, as you put it, a sort of measure of last resort.

DULLES SEES GAIN BY U. N. IN LEBANON—BELIEVES ITS OBSERVERS ARE ACHIEVING SOME RESULTS

(By Dana Adams Schmidt)

WASHINGTON, July 1.—Secretary of State Dulles said today that he believed the presence of United Nations observers in Lebanon was achieving "some results."

The United Nations operation, he said, may be slowing or even stopping infiltration of arms and men from Syria (questions 1 and 6).

These were the most hopeful words on the Lebanese crisis yet heard at the State Department. They coincided with reports to the Department from Lebanon that the insurgents had made their maximum efforts against Tripoli and Beirut and that the efforts might now be expected to decline.

At his news conference Mr. Dulles gave cold comfort both to those who have been urging United States military intervention in Lebanon and to those who have been maintaining that the United States should not intervene under any circumstances.

He stuck to the line that direct intervention should be avoided if the United Nations could do that job but that the possibility of direct intervention could not be ruled out under certain circumstances. These circumstances he declined to define (question 6).

The normal way to deal with a problem such as has arisen in Lebanon, Mr. Dulles explained, is through United Nations processes.

"But," he added with emphasis, "we have never believed that you could act only" under such processes. If use of the United Nations became impractical, direct military action to meet an armed attack might be taken under article 51 of the United Nations

Charter, which was put into the charter to meet just such an emergency, he said.

While declining to define all the circumstances under which we might respond to a request for direct military intervention in Lebanon, Mr. Dulles pointed out that an armed revolt fomented from abroad could be regarded as equivalent to an armed attack (question 6).

In response to a question, the Secretary observed that he doubted whether it would be practical to try to put enough United Nations troops into Lebanon to seal the border (question 8).

#### OBSERVATION IS TEMPERED

He tempered this observation by adding that he did not want to pass final judgment on the question of sealing the border with United Nations forces "until I saw what kind of a case the Government of Lebanon could make if they were to make such a request of the Security Council."

Spokesmen of the Lebanese Government have for weeks been saying that they did not think observers would be sufficient to halt the influx of men and materials for territory controlled by President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic, of which Syria is a part. The next step, they have said, would be a call to the United Nations for an international police force to seal the border.

Foreign Minister Charles Malik said last Sunday that that would require 7,000 men. The United Nations Emergency Force now patrolling the Gulf of Aqaba and the Gaza strip numbers about 8,000 men.

One reason for Mr. Dulles' lack of enthusiasm for a new United Nations force may be that the State Department's experts doubt whether the proposal could get a two-thirds majority in the United Nations Assembly over the opposition of the United Arab Republic and its Asian-African friends and of the Soviet bloc.

Asked whether, in the light of the United States' record during the British-French invasion of Suez in 1956, it was realistic to "think that we would participate in any kind of military intervention in Lebanon except under the most extreme circumstances," Mr. Dulles replied hotly:

"I don't think that there is any analogy whatsoever between the situation in Lebanon, where the lawful government is calling for assistance, and the Suez case, where the armed intervention was against the will of the government concerned. There is no parallel whatever between the two cases."

"We do believe that the presence in Lebanon of foreign troops, however justifiable—and it is thoroughly justifiable from a legal and international law standpoint—is not as good a solution as for the Lebanese to find a solution themselves. It would be, as you put it, a sort of measure of last resort" (question 9).

#### SUPPORT FOR KLAMATH RESERVATION PURCHASE BILL BY FORMER PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on June 27 I reviewed for the Senate the shabby role which the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association has played in trying to defeat S. 3051, the Klamath Indian Reservation purchase bill which I have sponsored at the request of the national administration.

Now I have a happier announcement to make with respect to this organization. This will demonstrate how far out of touch the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association is with responsible lumbermen's opinion.



I have received a most encouraging and heartwarming letter from Ralph B. Macartney, of Klamath Falls, Oreg., who served as president of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association in 1953. For many years he was the manager at Klamath Falls for the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. This is not only the Nation's largest timber company, but their operation at Klamath Falls is the largest in the area. They own a sizable acreage of land and manage their timber on sustained yield. Mr. Macartney supports S. 3051, and commends and indorses my handling of this legislation.

His approval of S. 3051 is without serious qualification. For example, this leading retired lumber manufacturer and ex-president of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association has described our bill as the only practical solution to a troublesome situation.

Mr. Macartney is a Republican, as he states in his letter. Indeed, he says he is "a conservative Republican." But he is a man who puts the welfare of his county and his State—as well as that of his country—ahead of narrow political partisanship. And so he has written me a letter of personal commendation and of indorsement for what I am attempting to do with respect to the preservation of the great Klamath pine forest and marsh.

In turn, I desire to thank Mr. Ralph B. Macartney and to assure him that only by such open minded and fair attitudes as he has shown can we successfully resolve the problems facing our country.

I think it is very significant when an individual of Mr. Macartney's background and experience makes the following statement in connection with the impact the Klamath Termination Act will have, unless it is amended by this Congress:

A sale of this timber in small units in a limited time could only result in a boom and a bust for Klamath Falls. It would result in several new sawmill operations that would cut the timber rapidly and then fold up and also in the closing of some of the present sawmills that now depend on Indian timber for their log supply. \* \* \* I would hate to see the Indian timber, which has been excellently managed in the past, be now butchered up and have little prospect of having any value for at least a hundred years.

Perhaps the most salient point in Mr. Macartney's letter is as follows:

It seems to me that the National Lumber Manufacturers Association's approach to this problem is on a theoretical basis in that they are opposed to Government acquisition of more timber, as I am, but they are not looking at a practical solution of the problems of a community. They are not taking into consideration the fact that the timber for all practical purposes is now Government owned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Macartney's fine letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG., June 30, 1958.  
Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I am a conservative Republican and opposed to Government ownership but I want to compliment

you in your handling of the Klamath Indian bill.

I am a retired lumber manufacturer and was president of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association in 1953 which will give you my background.

As a resident of Klamath Falls I am interested in preserving the Indian forest on a sustained-yield unit. A sale of this timber in small units in a limited time could only result in a boom and a bust for Klamath Falls. It would result in several new sawmill operations that would cut the timber rapidly and then fold up and also in the closing of some of the present sawmills that now depend on Indian timber for their log supply.

It seems to me that your bill is the only practical solution to a troublesome situation and although the timber is not now technically owned by the Government it pays no taxes and practically is the same as Government owned and if the United States Forest Service acquires it Klamath County would receive in place of taxes 25 percent of the income for sale of stumpage.

I do not believe any private person or company could afford to buy this timber at its appraised prices and cut it on a sustained-yield basis because of the heavy carrying charges and still the Indians are entitled to the present market price on their timber.

I have managed a large timber holding which I operated on a sustained-yield basis and being interested in conservation of timber I would hate to see the Indian timber, which has been excellently managed in the past, be now butchered up and have little prospect of having any value for at least a hundred years.

It seems to me that the National Lumber Manufacturers Association's approach to this problem is on a theoretical basis in that they are opposed to Government acquisition of more timber, as I am, but they are not looking at a practical solution of the problems of a community. They are not taking into consideration the fact that the timber for all practical purposes is now Government owned.

I hope you are successful in obtaining the passage of your bill.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH R. MACARTNEY.

#### TRIBUTE TO DAVID LAWRENCE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I noted with interest yesterday an editorial in the Evening Star entitled "Forty Years of Columning." The editorial has to do with the life work and some of the achievements of the editor of the U. S. News & World Report and the author of a daily press column, David Lawrence. I think the editorial is historical. It is also a landmark, in a measure, of 40 years of outstanding work on Capitol Hill in the very best traditions of the great profession of newspaper writing and reporting. At the same time it represents an outstanding story of personal success. The editorial is fairly brief, and I should like to read it to the Senate:

Forty years ago this week a page advertisement inserted in Editor & Publisher by the New York Evening Post announced that "the daily telegraphic article by David Lawrence," its Washington correspondent, "now appears in the Washington Star." It has been appearing there ever since, except for an interval of about 2 weeks which marked Mr. Lawrence's unsuccessful and single experiment of taking a vacation from writing. And we think it is appropriate to note, with pleasure, this 40th anniversary of Mr. Lawrence's first appearance in the Star.

He had come to Washington fresh from his Princeton graduation in 1910, as a member of the Washington Bureau of the Associated Press. His friendship with Woodrow Wilson during his undergraduate days sent him to the White House for the Associated Press, where he remained for about 6 years. He became Washington correspondent of the Evening Post in 1916, and a canny forecast of Wilson's defeat of Charles Evans Hughes in that year's campaign created a market for syndicating his dispatches. The Star was the 17th daily paper to take him on. Now he writes for a daily audience of about 18 million readers of some 275 newspapers, in addition to editing his own highly successful magazine, the weekly U. S. News & World Report.

There have been times in his 40 years' association with the Star when Mr. Lawrence took off on a line of interpretation or comment that left us amazed. But there has been no time when he left us or anybody else with any doubts as to the strength of his own convictions—regardless of who might share them. And he has seemed happier, and more confident, when he found himself almost alone, instead of running with the pack—a quality that has retained the interest of many admirers, and added to his distinction as a journalist in a field planted with booby traps, where few survive.

Mr. President, the achievements of Mr. Lawrence are outstanding and in the best traditions of his profession, and, in my opinion, have in no small degree been due to his very fine personal qualities. Mr. Lawrence is intensely sincere and interested in humanity and the problems of the individual. As one of the admirers of his column and his magazine, and as one who knows him personally and knows of his very fine qualities, I rejoice in the notable record he has made. I am glad to make these comments, to perpetuate the excellent editorial, which reviews only in part the great work this man has done.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS OR JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Presiding Officer if a communication has been received from the President of the United States relative to an atomic proposal between this country and Great Britain?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The communication has been received.

On motion of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was—

Ordered, That the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign, during the period following the adjournment today, any enrolled bills or joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

#### THE UNITED STATES JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I desire to address myself for a few moments today to the question of the United States judicial system.

We have all been aware for a long time that our United States courts were being loaded up day by day, more and more, with minor matters, matters which should not have to be considered by those courts, and matters which were absolutely forestalling justice for many people

who were required to go to the Federal courts for justice.

I note that this week, on Monday, June 30, the House passed House bill 11102. That bill has two very salient and pertinent features which should help to reduce the caseload in the Federal courts.

As we all know, years ago Congress in its wisdom established a minimum limitation of \$2,000 with respect to Federal district court jurisdiction. In 1911 that was raised to \$3,000. Since then there has been a drastic devaluation of the dollar. The House bill changes the limitation from \$3,000 to \$10,000. At the time the figure of \$3,000 was placed in the statute, a case involving that sum was a case of considerable substance and seriousness. At the present time, with the devaluation of the dollar, \$10,000 represents approximately the same purchasing value as \$3,000 did in earlier days. The \$10,000 limitation which the House has placed in the bill is a very good one. Our Federal courts should not be required to adjudicate a great many minor cases. That is what our State courts are for; also to take care of cases which arise within a State. This change in the limit of jurisdiction will materially lessen the load on our Federal courts and assist them in handling the cases which they are required by law to consider.

There is a second situation which will be helped by the bill. By virtue of a legal fiction which we have employed for many years, a corporation which does all its business in State A may actually incorporate in State B. Many corporations incorporate under the laws of Delaware, for example; and yet, by virtue of the fiction that it is a foreign corporation, such corporations are constantly being brought into the Federal courts. The bill which the House has, in its wisdom, passed, would do away with this fiction; and, when corporations are actually doing business locally and are locally owned, they will be required to resort to the State courts. This is decidedly a step forward. Corporations which are actually local in character do not suffer from the problem of juries prejudiced against foreign corporations, and should therefore utilize the State courts.

The situation in which we find ourselves with respect to our Federal courts is this: Last year many Members of this body appeared before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and, as a result, that committee reported a series of bills which would add additional judges to take care of the legal business of the Federal courts. This aspect of the problem of loaded dockets in our Federal courts is still in need of correction.

The Federal district judge of today disposes of an average of 232 civil cases each year for each judge. In 1941, which was not too long ago, the average number of cases per judge was 169. The average backlog for each judge has increased from 149 cases in 1941 to 251 cases in 1957. This is on a national basis.

I believe that we can no longer ignore the fact that if a case cannot come to trial in a court, the litigants are denied justice, just as much as if they are de-

prived of citizenship and thus deprived of the opportunity to seek a remedy in court.

Sixty percent more civil cases are filed each year than were filed in 1941; yet there are only 26 percent more judges to handle such cases. One hundred and twelve percent more cases were pending at the end of the past year than were pending in 1941. Sometimes as many as 4 years now elapses between the date of issue and the time of trial. The date of issue means the time when all pleadings are in and the parties are at issues, and the case is ready for trial. Yet the people of the United States who must resort to our courts for justice are waiting as long as 4 years to get to trial.

Thirty-eight percent of all cases in district courts are subject to undue delay. Only 7 of the 94 districts now meet the standards set by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, which require not more than 6 months between the time of filing and the time of trial.

What a pathetic commentary this is on our Federal judicial system. Only 7 of 94 districts meet the minimum standard by being able to get to trial in a case 6 months after it has been filed. The national median is now 12 months. In some jurisdictions the time runs as high as 32 months.

Action is needed now. I am pleased to note that the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives has seen fit to schedule hearings for July 9 on the judgeship bills to which I have referred. I commend him for this action. I hope that we can speedily proceed toward Congressional approval of this critically needed legislation.

No lawyer who has practiced law, and no lawyer who is devoted to his profession, can help but look upon the situation which exists today in the Federal courts with a feeling of pain and frustration when he sees that our law, which we hold so dear, which we cherish, and to which we devote our lives, is torn apart by the failure of Congress to devote itself to the needs of the Federal courts.

The Senate approved many of these bills last year, but they have languished in the Judiciary Committee of the House. Political considerations in connection with the appointment of personnel should not be permitted to hold up these bills for the appointment of additional Federal judges. We cannot leave citizens of the United States in such a position that they cannot bring a case before a Federal court and have it tried within a reasonable time. If a litigant—and every one of us is a potential litigant at some time—cannot get a case to trial within a reasonable time, the situation is equivalent to one in which all rights to justice are taken away from him.

I, of course, represent, in part, but one State, Colorado. I should like to comment briefly upon the situation in my own State. The situation is no different from that in about 85 other judicial districts in the United States.

I listened with great interest to my colleagues who appeared before the Sen-

ate Judiciary Committee last year and told the committee of the troubles litigants in their own States and in their own districts were having in bringing cases to trial.

In speaking of my own State, I am not putting particular emphasis upon one State. I am using only one example as a basis for illustrating what the situation is throughout the length and breadth of the country.

Colorado has two district judges. A third was recommended by the Judicial Conference in March 1955, and this recommendation has been renewed every year thereafter.

Notwithstanding the continuous flow of visiting judges from other parts of the circuit into the district of Colorado, the delays continue to increase substantially. In 1957, 60 criminal trials, or an average of 30 for each of our judges, were held in the State of Colorado.

When we compare the average of 30 trials per judge with the national average of 13 per judge, we realize that our 2 judges in Colorado have devoted themselves assiduously and wholly to performing the job to which the President appointed them.

The median time from filing to disposition of civil cases in the State of Colorado is 21 months, compared with the national median of 14. As I have said before, the Judicial Conference recommends six.

Civil cases filed in the first three quarters of fiscal 1958 were 23 percent higher than during the same period in the previous year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement showing the number of cases filed in the first three quarters of this fiscal year, together with seven attached tables showing the condition of the dockets and the flow of justice in the Federal courts of Colorado.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During the current fiscal year there has been an increase in the civil, private civil, and criminal cases filed over the same period last year and an increase in civil, pending as shown by the following table.

1st 3 quarters of fiscal years 1957 and 1958

	Filed	Terminated	Pending
All civil cases:			
1st 3 quarters, 1957.....	253	241	329
1st 3 quarters, 1958.....	312	252	372
Private civil cases:			
1st 3 quarters, 1957.....	145	129	243
1st 3 quarters, 1958.....	164	142	255
Criminal cases:			
1st 3 quarters, 1957.....	272	233	106
1st 3 quarters, 1958.....	304	237	104

The district continues to make a liberal use of visiting judges from other districts in the circuit, but the time for reaching trial is still far above the Judicial Conference standard of 6 months from filing to trial for the average civil case.

Statistical tables are attached.  
WILL SHAFROTH,  
Chief of the Division of Procedural  
Studies and Statistics, Adminis-  
trative Office of the United States  
Courts.



## DISTRICT OF COLORADO

TABLE 1.—Civil cases commenced and terminated, by fiscal year, and pending at the end of each year beginning with 1941

Fiscal year	Com-menced	Ter-mi-nated	Pending June 30
Total civil cases:			
1941.....	193	183	99
1942.....	212	215	96
1943.....	278	215	159
1944.....	211	234	136
1945.....	647	461	322
1946.....	590	630	282
1947.....	385	481	186
1948.....	246	255	177
1949.....	327	291	213
1950.....	438	339	332
1951.....	368	349	351
1952.....	361	346	366
1953.....	419	363	422
1954.....	365	282	505
1955.....	319	405	419
1956.....	346	448	317
1957.....	328	333	312
1st 3 quarters 1958.....	312	252	372
Private civil cases:			
1941.....	70	71	50
1942.....	38	56	32
1943.....	43	42	33
1944.....	41	42	32
1945.....	39	27	44
1946.....	44	46	42
1947.....	87	61	68
1948.....	98	81	85
1949.....	119	103	101
1950.....	191	123	169
1951.....	137	126	180
1952.....	149	127	202
1953.....	185	112	275
1954.....	204	144	335
1955.....	170	221	284
1956.....	204	261	227
1957.....	192	186	233
1st 3 quarters 1958.....	164	142	255

TABLE 2.—United States civil cases and criminal cases commenced and terminated, by fiscal year, and pending at the end of each year beginning with 1941

Fiscal year	Com-menced	Ter-mi-nated	Pending June 30
United States civil cases (United States a party): <sup>1</sup>			
1941.....	123	112	49
1942.....	174	159	64
1943.....	235 ( 67)	173	126
1944.....	170 ( 48)	192	104
1945.....	608 (506)	434	278
1946.....	546 (390)	584	240
1947.....	298 (174)	420	118
1948.....	148 ( 16)	174	92
1949.....	208 ( 63)	188	112
1950.....	267 ( 58)	216	163
1951.....	231 ( 98)	223	171
1952.....	212 ( 71)	219	164
1953.....	234 ( 64)	251	147
1954.....	161	138	170
1955.....	149	184	135
1956.....	142	187	90
1957.....	136	147	79
1st 3 quarters 1958.....	148	110	117
Criminal cases: <sup>2</sup>			
1941.....	147	158	30
1942.....	256	228	58
1943.....	315	289	84
1944.....	495	423	156
1945.....	352	353	155
1946.....	234	293	96
1947.....	307	327	68
1948.....	313	299	51
1949.....	270	272	39
1950.....	411	359	45
1951.....	375	348	56
1952.....	453	379	100
1953.....	448	387	137
1954.....	384	387	118
1955.....	362	382	90
1956.....	319	321	67
1st 3 quarters 1958.....	304	237	104

<sup>1</sup> Price and rent control cases are in parentheses. Price and rent control cases are separately listed from 1943 to 1953. In many of these years they constituted a large proportion of all civil cases commenced, although they required on the average a relatively small proportion of court time per case for disposition. They are included in the figure which they follow.

<sup>2</sup> Cases transferred are not included in "Commenced" and "Terminated" columns.

TABLE 3.—Cases commenced per judgeship

Fiscal year	Number of judgeships	Total civil cases		Private civil cases		Criminal cases (less immigration) <sup>1</sup>	
		Colorado	National average <sup>1</sup>	Colorado	National average <sup>1</sup>	Colorado	National average <sup>1</sup>
1941.....	1	193	164	70	82	147	153
1942.....	1	212	168	38	77	256	161
1943.....	1	278	158	43	58	315	174
1944.....	1	211	169	41	56	495	184
1945.....	1	647	295	39	57	352	176
1946.....	1	590	321	44	70	234	142
1947.....	1	385	271	87	109	307	134
1948.....	1	246	205	98	117	313	123
1949.....	1	327	238	119	121	270	123
1950.....	1	458	222	191	113	411	116
1951.....	1	368	204	137	111	375	106
1952.....	1	361	236	149	126	451	112
1953.....	1	419	261	185	146	386	114
1954.....	2	183	210	102	127	217	103
1955.....	2	160	212	85	126	180	104
1956.....	2	173	225	102	135	176	102
1957.....	2	164	236	96	151	156	105

<sup>1</sup> This column includes 86 districts for 1949 and thereafter; 84 districts before 1949.

<sup>2</sup> Immigration cases have been eliminated from this table because they occur in volume in only 5 districts on the Mexican border and because the average judicial time per case for their disposition is small.

TABLE 4.—Time elapsing in civil cases tried<sup>1</sup>

Fiscal year	Number of cases tried	Median interval in months from filing to disposition		Median interval in months from issue to trial	
		Colorado	National median	Colorado	National median
1945.....	5	—	9.0	—	5.3
1946.....	25	6.9	8.9	4.1	5.0
1947.....	11	—	9.0	—	5.1
1948.....	19	—	9.9	—	5.8
1949.....	22	—	10.4	—	5.9
1950.....	16	—	11.2	—	6.7
1951.....	28	16.8	12.2	11.2	7.3
1952.....	39	15.0	12.1	11.0	7.0
1953.....	38	18.6	12.4	11.1	7.4
1954.....	21	*23.0	13.5	*13.7	8.1
1955.....	54	29.5	14.6	18.3	9.1
1956.....	63	25.3	15.4	13.7	10.3
1957.....	37	21.4	14.2	11.0	9.0

<sup>1</sup> The median time interval in months is computed for the civil cases in which a trial was held, which were terminated during the year, excluding land condemnation, habeas corpus, and forfeiture proceedings. No median interval is shown for the years 1945 through 1952 where less than 25 cases were terminated after trial. For the year 1953 and subsequent years, where there were less than 25 cases terminated after trial, a median is listed with an asterisk (\*) on the basis of the number of cases terminated after trial for the last 2 years, provided there were 25 such cases for the 2 years.

TABLE 5.—Cases commenced per judgeship in this district and in 86 districts by nature of suit, fiscal year 1956

Nature of suit	Total trials		Civil		Criminal	
	Colorado	National average <sup>1</sup>	Colorado	National average <sup>1</sup>	Colorado	National average <sup>1</sup>
1951.....	1	70	39	34	28	36
1952.....	1	85	40	39	27	46
1953.....	1	65	44	36	29	15
1954.....	2	43	40	14	25	29
1955.....	2	56	41	30	26	15
1956.....	2	59	43	32	29	27
1957.....	2	52	40	22	27	30

TABLE 5.—Cases commenced per judgeship in this district and in 86 districts by nature of suit, fiscal year 1956—Continued

Nature of suit	Total trials		Civil		Criminal	
	Colorado	National average <sup>1</sup>	Colorado	National average <sup>1</sup>	Colorado	National average <sup>1</sup>
United States cases—Continued						
United States defendant.....	16	18				
Enjoin Federal agencies.....	3	3				
Habeas Corpus.....	1	3				
Tort Claims Act.....	2	4				
Tax suits.....	8	5				
Other.....	3	3				
Private cases:						
Federal question.....	24	33				
Copyright.....	1	1				
Employers' Liability Act.....	3	6				
Fair Labor Standards Act.....	1	1				
Habeas corpus.....	3	3				
Jones Act.....	2	10				
Miller Act.....	2	2				
Patent.....	2	3				
Other.....	13	7				
Diversity of citizenship.....	79	90				
Insurance.....	8	15				
Other contracts.....	21	16				
Real property.....	10	3				
Personal injury (motor vehicle).....	24	33				
Personal injury (other).....	11	17				
Other diversity.....	5	5				
Admiralty.....	11	11				

Criminal cases (less immigration)	Colorado	86 districts
Total cases.....	176	102

TABLE 6.—Civil and criminal trials commenced, by fiscal year

Fiscal year	Total trials commenced	Civil			Criminal		
		Total	Nonjury	Jury	Total	Nonjury	Jury
1951.....	70	34	26	8	36	—	36
1952.....	85	39	30	9	46	5	41
1953.....	65	36	27	9	29	6	23
1954.....	85	28	14	14	57	7	50
1955.....	111	59	45	14	52	6	46
1956.....	117	64	51	13	53	4	49
1957.....	103	43	32	11	60	8	52

Civil and criminal trials commenced per judgeship

Fiscal year	Number of judgeships	Total trials		Civil		Criminal	
		Colorado	National average <sup>1</sup>	Colorado	National average <sup>1</sup>	Colorado	National average <sup>1</sup>
1951.....	1	70	39	34	28	36	11
1952.....	1	85	40	39	27	46	13
1953.....	1	65	44	36	29	29	15
1954.....	2	43	40	14	25	29	15
1955.....	2	56	41	30	26	26	15
1956.....	2	59	43	32	29	27	14
1957.....	2	52	40	22	27	30	13

<sup>1</sup> This column includes 86 districts.

TABLE 7.—Civil cases pending per judgeship on June 30, 1956

Nature of suit	Cases pending per judgeship	
	Colorado	National average
Total civil cases.....	159	236
United States civil cases.....	45	74
Private civil cases.....	114	162
United States plaintiff.....	27	46
Land condemnation.....	6	14
Antitrust.....	—	—
Other enforcement suits.....	1	5
Forfeitures and penalties.....	4	4
Negotiable instruments.....	3	8
Other contracts.....	8	9
Other.....	5	7

TABLE 7.—Civil cases pending per judgeship on June 30, 1956—Continued

Nature of suit	Cases pending per judgeship	
	Colorado	National average
United States defendant.....	19	27
Tort Claims Act.....	3	7
Tax suits.....	9	8
Other.....	7	13
Federal question.....	24	44
Antitrust.....	3	2
Copyright.....	1	1
FELA.....	3	8
Jones Act.....	1	16
Patent.....	2	5
Other.....	15	11
Diversity of citizenship.....	90	98
Insurance.....	8	11
Other contracts.....	25	20
Real property.....	10	3
Personal injury (motor vehicle).....	28	34
Personal injury (other).....	12	21
Other diversity.....	8	9
Admiralty.....		20

AGE OF CIVIL CASES PENDING ON JUNE 30, 1956

Jurisdiction	Total pending	Age of civil cases pending						
		Less than 6 months	6 months to 1 year	1 to 2 years	2 to 3 years	3 to 4 years	4 to 5 years	5 years and over
Total civil cases.....	317	125	86	67	21	9	3	6
United States civil.....	90	40	22	11	8	1	2	6
United States plaintiff.....	53	27	8	5	5		2	6
United States defendant.....	37	13	14	6	3	1		
Private civil.....	227	85	64	56	13	8	1	
Federal question.....	47	16	13	15	1	2		
Diversity.....	180	69	51	41	12	6	1	

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, there are a variety of new businesses producing new types of cases in the Federal district of Colorado. The tremendous uranium industry and allied industries are producing a substantial number of cases for the Federal docket. Many substantial new defense installations and defense-related private companies have also caused a strain upon the docket.

Forty-six percent of the trials during the fiscal years 1952 to 1956 were conducted by visiting judges. Let us consider that fact for a moment. That is a sad commentary indeed, when, even though our two judges in Colorado are carrying a much greater load than the national average, it is necessary for us to have almost one-half of our judicial business in the Federal courts attended to by visiting judges. We have appreciated the devotion of the visiting judges to the problem. However, where additional judge power is needed continuously, it should be provided by Congress.

Another thing which has contributed to the problem in my State is the great increase in population. Percentage-wise, Colorado is one of the fastest growing States of the Nation. The United States census figures show a 21.7 percent gain from 1950 to 1956. Official estimates show a 40-percent increase in population by 1975. Nevertheless, we in Colorado are trying to limp along under a situation in which the existing two judges simply cannot, in the time allotted to them, take care of the cases.

Colorado has shown the 6th most rapid increase, as compared with 15th place between 1940 and 1950. In 1940 the population of Colorado was 1,120,000. In 1950 the population was 1,612,000. These are all Bureau of Census figures. It is now officially estimated to be 1,800,000.

The gain in Denver, the capital city, was 23.1 percent between 1950 and 1957. There are only five other cities in the United States which have had a greater rate of growth. The Denver metropolitan population is now officially estimated to be in excess of 800,000, and no doubt will be a million within a short time.

Mr. President, in conclusion I should like to say that I have been assured by both of our judges, who are very excellent and learned judges, and who are hard-working men on the bench, that if we get an additional judge our judges will have the authority and will sit outside of the city of Denver. In a State as large as Colorado, where we have only one judicial district, many people are required to resort for justice to the Federal courts. When there are not sufficient judges, and when the judges we have must sit at the State's capital city, it means that a great number of people who live in the outlying parts of the State are denied access to the courts. That is as bad a situation for them as if the courts did not exist at all.

Many people cannot afford to bring 5 or 6 or 7 or 10 witnesses to Denver, and to pay their expenses during the course of the trial, and to pay attorney's fees and the traveling expenses of the attorneys to the capital of the State.

In addition to reducing the delay, the additional judge is needed so that the Federal courts of our State may hold court in the places outside the capital city, where the law provides that may be done, so that our people may have access to the courts.

As one who has practiced law in a outlying community, I have seen not one but dozens of cases in which the sheer expense of litigation and the mere fact that people could not afford to bring attorneys and witnesses to court at the capital city precluded them from having access to the courts. If they are precluded from such access, they are denied justice just as much if there were no courts in existence.

Although I have used my State as an example, I listened to similar examples given by many other Members of the Senate before the Judiciary Committee last year, and I know that they have just as critical and just as burning situations in their own States. We in Congress have the duty to provide the necessary judges and facilities, so that the people may receive the benefit of a proper administration of justice. Justice which requires 2 or 3 or 4 years to obtain is justice delayed or denied. In fact, if it takes that long to get justice, we may as well say that there is no justice at all. It is time for Congress to face this problem and do something about it.

## ALASKAN STATEHOOD AN EVENT OF SYMBOLISM IN FORWARD MARCH OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most stirring and exhilarating events of our era has been the passage of the bill providing for the admission of Alaska as the 49th State of the Union. Writers of varying personal views have been enthused and moved by the symbolism and drama of what has occurred.

In the Washington Evening Star for July 2, 1958, were published two thoughtful and exciting columns about the admission of Alaska to statehood. One, by the noted commentator, William S. White, predicted that Alaska would become a notable addition to the political economy of the Pacific Northwest. The other, by David Lawrence, the editor of U. S. News & World Report, heralded the resources and industrial potential of the new State.

I feel, with William S. White and David Lawrence, that this historic event will have profound effects far beyond its seemingly intrinsic importance—and that men and women everywhere will hail this as a milestone in the forward march of the great American Nation.

Mr. President, as one who had the great honor and privilege of presiding over the United States Senate during the historic rollcall which admitted Alaska to statehood, I feel a particular sense of kinship with the subject of these two able columns—a kinship heightened by my own military service in Alaska and the Yukon during World War II. Alaska means the great land, and a great land it will surely be as part of our Union. To see the great ocean fiords of southeastern Alaska, the noble and majestic summit of Mount McKinley, the sweeping surge of the Yukon and Kuskokwim Rivers—this is to feel the pulse and rhythm of Alaska's onward march to progress and prosperity.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the two columns from the Washington Star of July 2 be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the columns were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

### THE NATION MARCHES WESTWARD—ENTRY OF ALASKA VIEWED AS SHIFTING BALANCE OF POLITICAL INFLUENCE

(By William S. White)

A great, fresh wind of history is blowing in from the Pacific Northwest.

Alaska's admission to the Union has brought a clean sense of drama to this tired and jaded Capital. Before the eyes of a new generation the country is again marching westward.

Moreover, by act of Congress, the boastfulness attributed to Texas and California can never be quite what it was. Texas is no longer the biggest. Alaska's area is twice as great. California's Mount Whitney is dwarfed by Alaska's Mount McKinley.

In the longer and deeper sense, Alaska's entry as a State will have profound effects on the public life of this country. It will mean a fundamental alteration of the balance of political power on legislative matters.

Alaska's success signals, immediately or distantly, these things:

1. Two additional Democratic Senate seats after the November election. (The assump-



tion is general here that Alaska will go Democratic at the start, if not necessarily remaining Democratic thereafter.)

2. A great rise in the influence of the West, particularly in the Senate. There, an unadvertised coalition between western and the more modern southern Democrats already has been functioning quietly for more than a year.

3. An accelerating decline in the national veto power of the Old South, which has largely dominated Congress for 20 years.

4. A swiftened parting in the South between the moderate new politicians and the Southern Old Guard. That Old Guard, which on the whole is as touchingly gallant as it is out of touch with current reality, is going down fighting. But going down it is.

All this will mean, too, a progressively lesser place, in Congress at least, for the urban eastern liberals of both parties. For they are not too much at home with western liberals except on such issues as civil rights.

The westerners are most of all concerned—and Alaska's new Congressional delegation next year will be, too—with the issues of construction as distinguished from the issues of reform. Their first interest is in such bread and butter matters as public power and reclamation.

They have a world to win, and so do the new southerners, whereas the easterners have only a world to hold. Thus the westerners are making common cause with the new southerners on many matters—of which Alaska is only latest and most dramatic.

Indeed, Alaskan statehood itself was a western-southern triumph. The West was out in front. But the southern moderates call the signals.

The modern southerners could not come too far forward for two reasons. They did not wish to stir up their still glumly resisting old southern colleagues any more than need be. And they felt it only right that the westerners should be out in front, since Alaska as a State will be a member here of the far western bloc.

Thus the running of the show was passed from the Senate Democratic leader, LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, to his assistant, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana. Senator MANSFIELD turned over tactical operations to Senator HENRY M. JACKSON of Washington. Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER of Oregon was asked to preside over the Senate when the vote for statehood was taken.

Senators MANSFIELD, JACKSON, NEUBERGER and such Western Republican allies as Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL of California, performed with the light touch they had learned from the moderate southern parliamentary virtuosos.

They were so mannerly with the opposition as all but to disarm the old southerners. This will be the way of the coalition of the West and the New South—it will have the vigor of the one and the skill of the other.

And this is perhaps the most significant circumstance of all for the future. For the coalition is aware of the force of what Churchill said when he was criticized for speaking softly to the Japanese Ambassador in London on Britain's declaration of war after Pearl Harbor:

"When you are about to kill a man it does no harm to be polite."

ALASKA, A NEW ADVENTURE—INCREASED TRADE IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST SEEN, WITH INDIRECT IMPACT ON UNITED STATES

(By David Lawrence)

It isn't often that a State is admitted to the Union. The last time it happened was 46 years ago when Arizona and New Mexico came in. The event caused a lot of excitement then, and the boom isn't over in those States yet. The admission of Alaska will

bring the same kind of excitement, new hope and new adventure.

For a new State means new opportunities for millions of people. It means some hardship, of course, for new settlers. But it means also a chance to make money—and that's a motivation which has stirred men many times in America history. Thus the "gold rush" to the Klondike area in Alaska in 1896 took on the same pattern as the "gold rush" to California in 1849.

What does the entry of a new State really mean? It affects not merely those who want to set up a stake in the 103 million acres previously owned by the Government that will be thrown open to settlement. Our own Pacific Northwest will benefit by the increased trade, and indirectly there will be an impact commercially on the people of the United States as a whole.

For if Alaska—which in area is twice the size of Texas—becomes more heavily populated, it means a new market for many products. Likewise, if the valuable oil resources of Alaska are developed, it could mean that the American consumer of oil will be less dependent on the oil that comes from the troublous Middle East. It could mean that tankers some day will go from Alaskan ports to some Asian countries. Oil means a chance for industrialization of regions not now able to buy cheap fuel.

Politically, Alaska will add a few electoral votes. There will be 98 United States Senators instead of 96, and 436 Members of the United States House of Representatives instead of 435. In a close situation—as, for instance, in the Senate where in recent years there has been almost a tie between the two parties—the two Alaska votes could be decisive on many questions of public policy.

Internationally, the addition of Alaska to the Union should not mean much change. But there is perhaps a sentimental difference when one of our States becomes the border of the mainland of Russia, and it is no longer an area of just Territorial or colonial status. Certainly there will be more of a national consciousness now that the United States is actually adjacent to Soviet Russia in the Siberian region.

To many Americans Alaska is something remote, a place that's very cold in winter. It's true that Alaska is the first State of the Union that reaches across the Arctic Circle, but its resources are fabulous.

The opponents of statehood argued that it would mean a radical change in the character of the Union, for now there will be a big expanse of land between the other 48 States and the 49th. The same argument will be employed against admitting the islands of Hawaii, which are heavily populated with Americans of Japanese origin. The reason Alaska's friends have had a hard time in Congress has been that to admit Alaska hitherto meant adding Hawaii, too. The proponents of Alaskan statehood managed to separate the two issues, and that's why Alaska got in.

It isn't so certain what Hawaii's fate will be. One group argues that there is too much communistic activity in Hawaii, and the other thinks a good way to get rid of it would be to admit Hawaii into the Union.

Certainly a new State can establish a full system of State courts of its own and a whole set of administrative facilities. It is no longer dependent on the Federal Government in Washington, which usually handles all Territorial affairs in an already overburdened Department of the Interior.

Looking northward, in between the 48 States and the 49th, there is the vast area of western Canada. A good highway goes from our Pacific Northwest to Alaska, and the trip takes about 7 days by automobile. Airline planes cover the distance in a few hours.

It's possible that there now will be a revival of talk about a merger with Canada. This has often been suggested in American

history but has always met with disfavor by most of the people of Canada, whose basic ties are with Britain. Fundamentally Americans, like Britons and Canadians, will object to anything likely to deprive each of their national traditions. But with what has been happening in the world in recent years, especially in defense problems in the Arctic, it is not unthinkable that Britain and Canada will be urged to join a three-cornered union of some kind with the United States.

Anyway, Alaska now is in the Union—not formally and technically yet, but for all practical purposes—and the people in all parts of the United States, particularly the youth hunting jobs nowadays and families in search of adventure, can go west in their covered station wagons and try their luck in the new bonanza of the North American Continent.

## ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 3, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

- S. 803. An act for the relief of Claudio Guillen;
- S. 2168. An act for the relief of Armas Edwin Jansson-Viik;
- S. 2251. An act for the relief of Manley Francis Burton;
- S. 2493. An act for the relief of Maria G. Aslanis;
- S. 2819. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hermine Melamed; and
- S. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim July 4, 1958, a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship.

## ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday July 7, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 3, 1958:

### IN THE ARMY

The following named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

### To be major generals

- Brig. Gen. John Simpson Guthrie, O18228, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
- Brig. Gen. Louis Victor Hightower, O18502, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
- Brig. Gen. Francis Thomas Pachler, O18488, United States Army.
- Brig. Gen. Herbert Lucian Scofield, O29462, United States Army.
- Brig. Gen. Paul Russell Weyrauch, O18252, United States Army.
- Brig. Gen. William Henry Hennig, O17122, United States Army.
- Brig. Gen. Cyrus Abda Dolph 3d, O19170, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).
- Brig. Gen. Briard Poland Johnson, O29393, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Victor James MacLaughlin, O18580, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).  
Brig. Gen. Bogardus Snowden Cairns, O18798, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 3, 1958:

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Arthur J. Stanley, Jr., of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 3, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Ernest C. Hicks, district superintendent, the Methodist Church, McAlester, Okla., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, we enter into Thy gates with thanksgiving and into Thy courts with praise. As we approach the birthday of our Nation, we pause to give Thee special thanks for the creative thinking and intrepid heroism of our fathers.

For it was in an age when the Old World faltered at the shoreline of political development, that our fathers launched their vessel upon an uncharted sea, venturing to work out their own salvation beneath the blazing light of a new age, and the leadership of Thy divine spirit.

So do we rejoice today that, weak and frail as we are, we have never lost the vision of Thy truth, Thy justice, and charity.

Bless, we pray Thee, all in places of leadership and authority, that Thy name may forever be honored and glorified; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 30, 1958:

H. R. 12428. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12695. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates and to provide for the repeal of the taxes on the transportation of property;

H. J. Res. 640. Joint Resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1959, providing for increased pay costs for the fiscal year 1958, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12181. An act to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12586. An act to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal

Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury.

On July 2, 1958:

H. R. 2548. An act to authorize payment for losses sustained by owners of wells in the vicinity of the construction area of the New Cumberland Dam project by reason of the lowering of the level of water in such wells as a result of the construction of New Cumberland Dam project;

H. R. 4260. An act to authorize the Chief of Engineers to publish information pamphlets, maps, brochures, and other material;

H. R. 4683. An act to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the Lake Greeson Reservoir, Narrows Dam;

H. R. 6322. An act to provide that the dates for submission of plan for future control of property and transfer of the property of the Menominee Tribe shall be delayed;

H. R. 6641. An act to fix the boundary of Everglades National Park, Fla., to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land therein, and to provide for the transfer of certain land not included within said boundary, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7081. An act to provide for the removal of a cloud on the title to certain real property located in the State of Illinois;

H. R. 7917. An act for the relief of Ernst Haeusserman;

H. R. 9381. An act to designate the lake above the diversion dam of the Solano project in California as Lake Solano;

H. R. 9382. An act to designate the main dam of the Solano project in California as Monticello Dam;

H. R. 10009. An act to provide for the reconveyance of certain surplus real property to Newaygo, Mich.;

H. R. 10035. An act for the relief of Federico Luss;

H. R. 10349. An act to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 11058. An act to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments;

H. R. 11399. An act relating to price support for the 1958 and subsequent crops of extra long staple cotton;

H. R. 12052. An act to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed at Stewarts Ferry, Tenn., as the J. Percy Priest Dam and Reservoir;

H. R. 12164. An act to permit use of Federal surplus foods in nonprofit summer camps for children;

H. R. 12521. An act to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to withhold certain amounts due employees of the House of Representatives;

H. R. 12613. An act to designate the lock and dam to be constructed on the Calumet River, Ill., as the "Thomas J. O'Brien lock and dam";

H. R. 12716. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 577. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1804. An act for the relief of Robert B. Cooper;

H. R. 7718. An act for the relief of Roy Hendricks, of Mountain View, Alaska; and

H. R. 12457. An act to further amend Public Law 85-162 and Public Law 84-141, to

increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6282. An act for the relief of the former shareholders and debenture note holders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation; and

H. R. 8439. An act to cancel certain bonds posted pursuant to the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, or the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 803. An act for the relief of Claudio Guillen;

S. 2168. An act for the relief of Armas Edwin Jansson-Vilk;

S. 2251. An act for the relief of Manley Francis Burton;

S. 2493. An act for the relief of Maria G. Aslanis; and

S. 2819. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hermine Melamed.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 489. An act for the relief of Mary K. Ryan and William A. Boutwell;

S. 2474. An act directing the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain land situated in the State of Virginia to the Board of Supervisors of York County, Va.;

S. 2629. An act for the relief of John J. Spriggs;

S. 3314. An act for the relief of the city of Fort Myers, Fla., and Lee County, Fla.;

S. 3894. An act for the relief of Joseph H. Lym, doing business as the Lym Engineering Co.; and

S. 3916. An act to amend the Shipping Act, 1916.

### CALL OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order heretofore entered making in order the call of the Private Calendar on Monday, July 7, 1958, be vacated, and that it may be in order to call the Private Calendar on Tuesday, July 8, 1958.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE DAY AS IT WAS CELEBRATED IN A FREE POLAND

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow on July 4 we will be celebrating our country's 182d Independence Day. At this time when our national prestige is suffering throughout the world, I take pleasure in inserting in the